



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,166	05/24/2000	Richard L. Sutherland	SAIC0006-US	5232

27510 7590 04/01/2002

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14TH STREET, N.W.
SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1756

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2002

//

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/577,166

Applicant(s)

SUTHERLAND ET AL.

Examiner

Martin J Angebrannt

Art Unit

1756

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 March 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____


3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☒ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 47.Claim(s) objected to: 44 and 45.Claim(s) rejected: 1-43, 46 and 48.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


Martin J Angebrannt
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1756

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Although it is the applicant's opinion that the Amako et al. LC holograms cannot be used as masters in holographic reproduction, there is no evidence that the hologram cannot be used in contact copying methods where a single beam is incident upon the hologram and the zero order acts as the reference beam and the diffracted first order acts as the object beam and the interference of the two generate the interference pattern to be recorded. There is no evidence/data that the holograms of Amako et al. cannot be used in this manner. The reference states that it can form CGHs which are assumed to have all the properties of holograms and therefore hold a three dimensional image, rather than the two dimensional image argued by the applicant. The examiner maintains the position that the Hall teachings that "[a] master hologram for each hologram can be either a computer generated hologram or an optically generated hologram" supports his position. The examiner notes that the PDLC holograms are electrically driven as are the other LC holographic materials (Amako et al.) and therefore would be reasonably assumed by one of ordinary skill in the art to have similar holographic properties. The examiner notes that the applicant argues that references in a piecemeal fashion and ignores the facts that the rejections are based upon a combination of references which when taken together render the invention claimed obvious.

